

1-1-1996

# An Evaluation Of The Reading Recovery Program At Hawthorn School In Salem, Illinois

Glen A. Bryant

*Eastern Illinois University*

This research is a product of the graduate program in [Educational Administration](#) at Eastern Illinois University. [Find out more](#) about the program.

---

## Recommended Citation

Bryant, Glen A., "An Evaluation Of The Reading Recovery Program At Hawthorn School In Salem, Illinois" (1996). *Masters Theses*. 217.  
<http://thekeep.eiu.edu/theses/217>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Student Theses & Publications at The Keep. It has been accepted for inclusion in Masters Theses by an authorized administrator of The Keep. For more information, please contact [tabruns@eiu.edu](mailto:tabruns@eiu.edu).

LB  
1861  
.C57x  
E34  
1996  
B7  
copy 2

AN EVALUATION OF THE READING RECOVERY  
PROGRAM AT HAWTHORN SCHOOL  
IN SALEM, ILLINOIS

BRYANT

THESIS REPRODUCTION CERTIFICATE

TO: Graduate Degree Candidates (who have written formal theses)

SUBJECT: Permission to Reproduce Theses

The University Library is receiving a number of requests from other institutions asking permission to reproduce dissertations for inclusion in their library holdings. Although no copyright laws are involved, we feel that professional courtesy demands that permission be obtained from the author before we allow theses to be copied.

PLEASE SIGN ONE OF THE FOLLOWING STATEMENTS:

Booth Library of Eastern Illinois University has my permission to lend my thesis to a reputable college or university for the purpose of copying it for inclusion in that institution's library or research holdings.

Glen A. Bryant  
Author

4-2-96  
Date

I respectfully request Booth Library of Eastern Illinois University not allow my thesis to be reproduced because:

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
Author

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

An Evaluation of the Reading Recovery Program

at Hawthorn School in Salem, Illinois

(TITLE)

BY

**Glen A. Bryant**

**FIELD EXPERIENCE**

SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS  
FOR THE DEGREE OF

**Specialist in Educational Administration**

IN THE GRADUATE SCHOOL, EASTERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY  
CHARLESTON, ILLINOIS

**1996**

YEAR

I HEREBY RECOMMEND THIS THESIS BE ACCEPTED AS FULFILLING  
THIS PART OF THE GRADUATE DEGREE CITED ABOVE

March 5, 1996  
DATE

Ronald W. Smalley  
ADVISER

March 5, 1996  
DATE

Beverly Snidley  
DEPARTMENT HEAD

A Field Experience:

An Evaluation of the Reading Recovery Program

At Hawthorn School

In Salem, Illinois

Glen A. Bryant

Eastern Illinois University

Spring 1996

Abstract

The purpose of the study was to determine the effectiveness of the Reading Recovery Program at Hawthorn School, in the Salem Elementary School District No. 111 in Salem, Illinois. The effectiveness of the Program was considered in terms of students discontinued, classroom teacher opinion, parent opinion, administrator opinion, and long term sustained effects. The participants in the study were the Reading Recovery Program teacher, first grade classroom teachers, the building administrator, children who participated in the Reading Recovery Program, and the parents of participating children. The study was conducted during the 1992-93, 1993-94, and 1994-95 school years. The study was limited to the Hawthorn School Reading Recovery Program during the three year study. The effectiveness of the program was demonstrated by a high percentage discontinuation rate; positive questionnaire results from teachers, parents, and administrators; and a high sustained effects rate.

## Table of Contents

Chapter I: Introduction . . . . .	3
Background and Significance of the Study. . . . .	3
Purpose . . . . .	4
Objectives . . . . .	4
Operational Definitions . . . . .	5
Uniqueness of the Study . . . . .	7
Assumptions . . . . .	7
Delimitations . . . . .	8
Chapter II: Related Literature and Research . . . . .	9
Review of Literature and Research . . . . .	9
Chapter III: Design of the Study . . . . .	15
Research Questions . . . . .	15
Sample and Population . . . . .	15
Procedures . . . . .	16
Data Collection and Instrumentation . . . . .	16
Data Analysis . . . . .	17
Chapter IV: Results and Conclusions. . . . .	18
Students Participating . . . . .	18
Classroom Teacher Opinion Survey . . . . .	19
Parent Opinion Survey . . . . .	21

Building Administrators Opinion Survey . . . . .	.23
Sustained Effects . . . . .	.24
Chapter V: Summary, Findings, and Recommendations . . . . .	.25
Summary and Findings . . . . .	.25
Recommendations . . . . .	.26
References . . . . .	.28
Appendices . . . . .	.31
A. Participating Students . . . . .	.31
B. Questionnaire for Classroom Teachers . . . . .	.33
C. Parent Opinion Questionnaire . . . . .	.35
D. Questionnaire for Administrators . . . . .	.37
E. Sustained Effects . . . . .	.39



## Chapter I

### Introduction

#### Background and Significance of the Study

During the 1992-93 school year, Salem Elementary School District #111, Salem, Illinois, started a Reading Recovery Program. The district sent one teacher to Eastern Illinois University to be trained. She worked with four students individually on a daily basis for 30 minutes of intensive instruction. As students discontinued the program other students entered the program. She worked with nine students, and five were extremely successful. In spite of the student success, some of the first grade teachers, the superintendent, and some of the board members were not completely sold on the program. While teachers agreed the students improved, they were not sure how well the program worked into the curriculum. The first grade had a leveled program. All students came from the same class of low students. When they finished the program, they had to stay in the low class or go into another class. When they went into another class, the program reduced the low class to less than ten and inflated the numbers in the other classes. By the third year of the program many of these problems were solved by adjusting grouping patterns. Students from reading recovery stayed in the same reading group which developed two smaller groups. This allowed them to work with first grade reading materials. Others were concerned about cost effectiveness.

The Reading Recovery Program was designed to identify first-grade students with pre-reading skills so limited that they were unable to learn how to read at a beginning first-

grade level; to provide daily thirty-minute intensive one-on-one instruction; to return the students, functioning successfully, to a regular first grade reading class in approximately three months; and to maintain success in reading through elementary school.

Hawthorn School is the primary attendance center for Salem Elementary School District #111. All first grade students in Salem attend this school. At the time of this study the Reading Recovery Program had been in operation for three years.

Reading Recovery was developed by Marie Clay (1984) in New Zealand. It came to the University of Ohio first and then to the University of Illinois. It spread throughout Illinois and became part of the Salem Elementary School in 1992. This investigation was designed to determine the long-term success of the program at Hawthorn School.

#### Purpose

The purpose of the field study was to study the Reading Recovery Program at Hawthorn School in the Salem Elementary School District for a three year period. The program's effectiveness and long-term sustained effects were considered in the study. The desired results were to provide information, to aid in specific decisions, and to improve the Reading Recovery Program in the Salem Elementary School District. The results and suggestions could also be applied to other school districts.

#### Objectives

The objectives of the field study were as follows:

1. To determine the effectiveness of student achievement in the Hawthorn School Reading Recovery Program revealed by the analysis of the pre and post tests given to all students in the program for the three year study.

2. To determine the effectiveness of the Hawthorn School Reading Recovery Program revealed through an analysis of teacher opinion surveys for the three year study.

3. To determine the effectiveness of the Hawthorn School Reading Recovery Program revealed through an analysis of the parent opinion surveys for the three year study.

4. To determine the effectiveness of the Hawthorn School Reading Recovery Program revealed through an analysis of the administrator opinion surveys for the three year study.

5. To determine the effectiveness of the Hawthorn School Reading Recovery Program revealed through an analysis of the students' reading levels, one and two years after completing the program..

#### Operational Definitions

1. Reading Recovery -- The program was designed to identify first grade students with pre-reading skills so limited that they were unable to learn how to read at a beginning first grade level and progress at a rate equal to an average first grade student. The program, created by Marie Clay of New Zealand, provides intensive one-on-one instruction daily for thirty minutes to identified students for approximately three months.

2. Effective program -- The effectiveness of the program was determined in terms of successfully completing the goals and objectives of the program as stated in the definition of Reading Recovery.

3. Discontinuation -- When a child demonstrates the ability to read at the level of regular classroom students, he/she leaves the Reading Recovery Program. This is also referred to as graduation or successful discontinuation. (see Appendix A)

4. Classroom Teacher Questionnaire-- An instrument that surveyed the opinions of teachers other than the Reading Recovery teacher. (see Appendix B)

5. Parent's Survey -- A survey designed to analyze parents' opinions about the effectiveness of the Reading Recovery Program. (see Appendix C)

6. Administrator's Questionnaire -- An instrument that surveyed the opinions of the principal of the school concerning the Reading Recovery Program. (see Appendix D)

7. Sustained Effects -- An analysis of the skills of students who had completed the program and a determination of the percentage of them still functioning at the average reading level for their grade.

8. Reading Recovery Checklist -- This checklist includes a list of skills associated with the Reading Recovery Program including letter identification, word identification, print concepts, writing dictation, and the number of words that a student can write in a 10 minute period.

9. Teacher Training -- A teacher must go through intensive training to be certified to teach Reading Recovery and he/she must participate in continuing education each year

to maintain his/her certification. Hawthorn School's teacher attended class at Eastern Illinois University for the 1992-93 school year. She attended one evening a week for two semesters and received six semester hours of graduate credit for the training.

10. Sample Population -- The students who have participated in the Hawthorn School Reading Recovery program during the three year study.

#### Uniqueness of the Study

Reading Recovery is a new program that is rigid and solution centered. It is rigid in the sense that the lesson always follows a specific pattern and the solution is found in responding to the reading behaviors demonstrated by the student. It has specific procedures, training, follow-up, and continuing education. Tests and data collection instruments are uniform. The parents are required to sign a contract and make a commitment to the program. The location of the study was Hawthorn Elementary School in Salem, Illinois. The length of the study was three years. This is the length of time the program has been in operation at the school.

#### Assumptions

It was assumed that the responses gathered from the faculty, parents, and administrators were sincere and accurate. It was assumed that enough responses were made to make this a responsible and worthwhile study. It was assumed that the length of the three year study would add importance to the findings.

Delimitations

The field study was limited to the Reading Recovery Program at Hawthorn School in Salem, Illinois. It was limited to the surveys and questionnaires given over the three years the program was operated. The author's opinion was that the instructor for the program was one of the best, but the program was limited to the instruction of one instructor. This was a limitation, but also a strength because it provided consistency. The concept of student achievement was not completely objective, since many variables such as training, delivery skills, and personality affected it.

## Chapter II

### Review of Literature and Research

Reading Recovery is a supplementary reading and writing program that was developed by Marie Clay in New Zealand. It has been implemented in Ohio since 1984. The goal of the program is to work with students at risk of failing and assist them to read at or above the average levels of their first grade peers. The children typically meet this goal in 12-16 weeks. The children are provided intensive individual instruction 30 minutes daily. The long-term goal is that these children no longer need Reading Recovery. Jane S. Gaffney and Barbara G. Gillespie (1989) stated that training in Reading Recovery changes the standard of acceptable performance to accelerate progress.

Training in Reading Recovery is essential for teachers to implement it. The training is rigorous and demanding, and is essential to the success of the program. The training is a year long program. Before the year starts, the teacher participates in a thirty hour training session on the administration, scoring, and use of the diagnostic survey. The teacher participates in a weekly in-service throughout the year and teaches four students daily. The teacher leaders who train the Reading Recovery teachers must participate in a one-year full-time training program.

Gay Sue Pinnell, Mary D. Freik, and Rose Mary Estice (1990) investigated Reading Recovery. In 1984 they began implementing the program in Ohio schools. The program is not designed to be a long-term program. The goal is to teach children to use

their knowledge and to see the purposes for it. When the child becomes an independent reader, the individual is discontinued, and another child begins the program.

In the Reading Recovery lessons, the teacher and child sit side by side reading and writing. There is an opportunity for oral interaction. The teacher observes the student and studies the child's technique. The teacher is trained to reward good techniques and prompt when necessary.

The Reading Recovery lesson has the following five components:

- (1) The student reads a familiar story.
- (2) The student reads while the teacher assumes the role of a neutral observer and takes a running record of text reading.
- (3) The child learns about letters and word analysis.
- (4) The child writes a story or message every day.
- (5) The child reads a new book.

The program was studied in New Zealand in the 1970's. Clay (1985) researched the program to determine whether it was possible to use early intervention to reduce reading failure. Discontinued Reading Recovery children were compared to higher achieving children who did not demonstrate any need for early intervention. After a year of study, the Reading Recovery children compared favorably. Follow-up studies indicated that children continued to make progress comparable to average groups of students. These results appeared to be consistent across ethnic, economic, and language groups. Starting in 1985, the study was duplicated at Ohio State University with similar results.



Reading Recovery is not a quick fix or an easy answer. It requires hard work and long term commitment. It may challenge existing programs and generate resistance among educators. The implementation should be made with sensitivity to existing programs and past contributions of individuals. There is no one answer to the problem. Reading Recovery is aimed at children having early reading difficulties regardless of the origin of the difficulties. According to Clay (1987), children are selected from the bottom 15 to 20 percent of their first-year class based on teacher judgment and a detailed diagnostic test.

The majority of children return to regular reading instruction and continue to succeed. Longitudinal studies conducted in New Zealand and Ohio (Lyons, 1988) prove the gains were sustained through third grade without any new interventions. According to Lyons, the program can be expected to clear out of the remedial education system most of the children who did not learn to read because of event-produced reasons and many children with organically based problems but who benefit from the strategies in spite of their problems. Some children do not achieve because of inappropriate teaching, absenteeism, or home life situations. Lyons also cites evidence that Reading Recovery can help a large proportion of faltering early readers, whether or not they are diagnosed "learning disabled."

The program should reduce problems in upper primary and elementary grades (Clay, 1985). It should be cost effective because it reduces the need for special education services in the school. The cost of educating one Reading Recovery teacher for Hawthorn

School was \$6,500.00. If Marie Clay is correct, this is not a costly investment. If students do not end up in special education classes for years and years, this will be a great savings for the district. Dyer (1992) wrote about the cost-effectiveness of Reading Recovery. Based on the experience of schools that have implemented the program, the author demonstrates that the long-term cost savings achieved through reductions in grade retentions, remedial Chapter I (Title I) services, and special education placements can more than offset the short-term costs of implementing and operating the Reading Recovery Program.

Pinnell (1985) gave a description of the teacher training process. One important aspect of the training is peer evaluation of demonstration lessons. Each teacher takes turns teaching lessons behind a one-way glass as the class observes and critiques. The class observes techniques and analyzes the student-teacher interaction during the lesson. They evaluate the skills practiced and determine if the teacher is responding to the needs of the student by using appropriate techniques. It is difficult for teachers in training to let go of their concepts and theories about learning and teaching reading. Through training, the teacher learns to build on the child's strengths, follow the child's lead, and observe. Teachers are encouraged to expect students to learn improved strategies by careful observation of the student's reading behaviors and use of approved strategies to respond to the students' efforts.

The program has been described as phenomenal success (Gaffney and Giles, 1989). The long-term goal is that children, who no longer need Reading Recovery,

continue to improve in reading and writing through their regular classroom instruction and independent reading. Teacher leaders go through a year of full-time training to become qualified to teach the program to Reading Recovery teachers.

Reading Recovery tries to take "at-risk" children and solve their early literacy problems before they become severe (Pinnell 1990). This is not a packaged program. No two children read the same books or the same sequence of books. The idea is to help students learn to use what they know to get to what they do not know. The key to the program, and the major investment, is teacher knowledge and skill. The required materials are minimal, basically books, pencils, and paper.

Clay (1991) has some strong ideas about introducing stories and how reading should be taught. She discussed how teachers can give children better access to a new story so that they can read it fluently and independently at the first reading. If teachers want children to learn to read new texts independently, they can help by providing a rich introduction to the story instead of reading the whole story in advance. The teacher's introduction creates a framework within which children can complete a first reading of a whole story. This strategy is one from the Reading Recovery Program that can be adapted and used in the regular reading class.

Spriegel (1995) studied traditional remedial programs and the Reading Recovery Program. Reading Recovery has documented high level success. In the first six years of the Ohio state project, 73%, 82%, 86%, 83%, 87%, and 88% discontinued. The children maintained their gains at least two years after discontinuing. Early intervention is

important, before students have developed strong but ineffective literacy habits. The instruction focuses on comprehension and not isolated skills. Children spend time reading at their instructional level. Students are taught strategies and how to transfer strategies to new situations. Writing and phonemic awareness are part of the program. Direct instruction is used to help students make accelerated progress. The principles of instruction are not the property of Reading Recovery. They can be a part of any program.

### Chapter III

#### Research Questions

The six research questions of this study were:

1. What percentage of students participating in the Reading Recovery Program discontinued during each of the three years studied?
2. How effective was the Hawthorn School Reading Recovery Program as determined by the first grade teachers with students participating in the program?
3. How effective was the Hawthorn School Reading Recovery Program as determined by the parents of students participating in the program?
4. How effective was the Hawthorn School Reading Recovery Program as determined by the building administrator?
5. What percentage of students discontinued from the Reading Recovery Program have maintained a grade of "C" or better in grade level reading classes, i.e., what are the sustained effects of this program over time?

#### Sample and Population

The study was conducted at Hawthorn Elementary School in Salem, Illinois, during the 1992-93, 1993-94, and 1994-95 school years. The sample consisted of the students who participated in the Reading Recovery Program. Nine students participated in 1992-93, eight in 1993-94, and nine in 1994-95.

### Procedures

For each year of the study, Reading Recovery Program records were examined and evaluated. Student records were examined to determine the number of students discontinued from the program each year. Parent surveys, teacher surveys, and administrator surveys were examined to determine effectiveness each year. The researcher determined the current status of each student during the month of January 1996 to determine the number of students continuing to maintain success after being discontinued from the program.

### Data Collection and Instrumentation

All Reading Recovery Programs in the state of Illinois have specific instruments that are part of the program. Each student has a file with an Illinois Reading Recovery Record of Progress form. Information on this form was used to make a list of students participating and their test results were used to determine their status upon exiting the program (see Appendix A). The Questionnaire for Classroom Teachers (see Appendix B) was given to all first grade teachers that had students participating in the program. Hawthorn School has five first grade teachers. The reading program was a leveled program. The five first grade classes were grouped according to ability and each teacher taught a different level. Two teachers had students participating each year. Different teachers filled out the forms each year because of changes in levels taught and staff changes. The Parent Opinion Survey was sent to every parent who had a child participate

in the Reading Recovery Program (see Appendix C). The principal of Hawthorn School was given the End of Year Questionnaire for Administrators each year (see Appendix D). The list of students who discontinued the program was used as a guide to contact current teachers and determine the sustained effects of the success of the program (see Appendix E).

All instruments were given each year of the three year study.

#### Data Analysis

The data was analyzed using descriptive statistics in the form of aggregated data and percentages.

## Chapter IV

### Results and Conclusions

#### Students Participating

The first research question was, "What percentage of students participating in the Reading Recovery Program discontinued during each of the three years studied?"

Hawthorn School had one Reading Recovery teacher that worked with four students daily. Students were tested and picked from the lowest 20 percentile of the first grade reading class. As the students discontinued, other students were added to the program (see Appendix A).

During the 1992-93 school year nine students participated in the Reading Recovery Program. One student moved early in the program, one student was transferred to a special education program, one student started the program late in the year and was not able to discontinue before the school year ended, and six students successfully discontinued the program. This calculates to a 75% discontinuing rate for the first year of the program.

During the 1993-94 school year eight students participated in the Reading Recovery Program. One student was transferred to a special education class and seven students successfully discontinued the program. This calculates to an 85% discontinuation rate for the second year of the program.



During the 1994-95 school year nine students participated in the Reading Recovery Program. All nine students successfully discontinued the program. This calculates to a 100% discontinuation rate for the third year of the program.

The average discontinuation rate for the program over the three year study was 87%. Eight or nine out of every ten students that participated in the Hawthorn School Reading Recovery Program successfully discontinued the program during the three year study.

#### Classroom Teacher Opinion Survey

The second research question was, "How effective was the Hawthorn School Reading Recovery Program as determined by the first grade teachers with students participating in the program?". Two first grade teachers worked with the Reading Recovery Program teacher each year. They were given questionnaires at the end of each year. The responses were analyzed in two ways. Questions one and five had a five point rating scale with one being the lowest and five the highest. Questions two, three, and four were categorized into positive or negative responses. The responses had to be completely positive to receive this label. Item six was not a question but a place for other comments (see Appendix B).

The first question was, "How much has the Reading Recovery teacher let you know about the progress of this/these student(s)?" All teachers marked the survey 5, indicating that the Reading Recovery teacher let the classroom teacher know a great deal

about the progress of the students in the program. The score was consistent during the three year study.

The second question was, "What changes have you observed in children participating in the Reading Recovery Program as they work in the classroom?". All responses were positive. The scores were consistent during the three year study. One teacher stated, "that the students were able to attack words and have a better attitude about reading," "Begin to love reading." Another teacher responded, "improved performance and self-confidence."

The third question was, "What do parents of Reading Recovery children say about the Reading Recovery Program?". All responses were positive. The scores were consistent during the three year study. One teacher stated, "They generally feel that it has helped their child become a better reader." Another teacher said, "Happy child is in the program."

The fourth question was, "Are you interested in having more children from your classroom involved in the Reading Recovery Program?". All responses were positive. The scores were consistent during the three year study. One teacher stated, "Yes, I have more that qualify." Another teacher said, "Yes, to improve their reading skills and make them enjoy reading books."

Number five was, "Circle the number below which best describes your view of the impact of the Reading Recovery Program on your classroom literacy program in general."

All teachers marked 5, indicating the impact was very good. The score was consistent during the three year study.

Number six was a place for other comments. One teacher did not respond, but all the other teachers chose to use the space to make a positive comment. One teacher stated, "Dedicated, hard working teacher is an asset to program." Another teacher said, "Sue does an excellent job with my class." "They enjoy working with her."

#### Parent Opinion Survey

The third research question was, "How effective was the Hawthorn School Reading Recovery Program as determined by the parents of students participating in the program?". All parents of students participating in the program were given an opinion survey. Seven parents returned the survey the first year (77%), six parents returned surveys the second year (75%), and seven parents returned surveys the third year (77%). This was a 76% response rate for the three year study (see Appendix C).

The first question was, "How has Reading Recovery affected your child's experience in school?". All parent responses were positive to this question. The score was consistent during the three year study. This was a 100% positive response rate. One parent stated, "It has been one of the most positive experiences if not the most in her young educational life." Another parent said, "It made it possible for him to bring his school book home, and sit down and read it to me without a lot of help." A third parent remarked, "He feels much better about reading in his class."

The second question was, "If you were telling another parent about the Reading Recovery Program, what would you say?". All responses were positive to this question. The score was consistent during the three year study. This was a 100% positive response rate. One parent stated, "It works." "It gives them self-confidence." Another parent said, "I would tell them it is one of the best programs the school offers." A third parent remarked that, "It was a superb program to help children having reading problems."

The third question was, "Did the Reading Recovery teacher let you know about your child's progress?". Two parents did not respond to this question, one gave a negative response, and the other parents all responded with positive comments. This was a 85% positive response rate. One parent stated, "Yes, note, phone call, in person." Another parent said, "Through letters or phone." A third parent remarked, "Yes, by phone and letters and conferences."

Number four was, "Circle the number below which best describes your view of Reading Recovery." One parent rated the program as a 4 and all the other parents rated the program a 5 meaning very good. The three year results indicate 95% of the parents regard the program as a 5 or very good.

Number five was a place for other comments. During the study five parents did not respond, but 75% of the parents answering the survey took this opportunity to make additional positive comments. One parent stated, "Keep this program going it really helps the kids." A second parent said, "I hope the program is continued in the future." A third

parent remarked, "The school has a great teacher to teach." "Keep up the great job for other children."

Building Administrator Opinion Survey

The fourth research question was, "How effective was the Hawthorn School Reading Recovery Program as determined by the building administrator?". The End of Year Questionnaire for Administrators asked the following questions:

1. What impact has Reading Recovery had on the children in your school this year?
2. What do teachers in your school say about Reading Recovery?
3. What do parents say about the Reading Recovery Program?
4. Circle the number below which best describes your view of Reading Recovery?
5. What are your concerns about implementing Reading Recovery in your school next year?

The questionnaire was given to the building principal each year and the responses were consistent. The program was rated 5 (very good) each year and all other comments were positive (see Appendix D). One administrator stated, "Reading Recovery has helped several children learn to read who were significantly below other students." A second remarked, "Parents of students in the program are very grateful their children were able to participate in this program." A third comment was, "Teachers feel their students have made excellent progress in the reading recovery program."

Sustained Effects

The fifth research question was, "What percentage of students discontinued from the Reading Recovery Program have maintained a grade of 'C' or better in grade level reading classes?". During the 1992-93 school year six students discontinued the Reading Recovery program (see Appendix E). Five students have successfully sustained a satisfactory level of performance on grade level in their reading class. This establishes an 80% success sustained effects rate for this group. The students are currently fourth grade students.

During the 1993-94 school year seven students discontinued the Reading Recovery Program. Six students have successfully sustained a satisfactory level of performance on grade level in their reading class. This establishes an 85% success sustained effects rate for this group. The students are currently third grade students.

During the 1994-94 school year nine students discontinued the Reading Recovery Program. Seven students have successfully sustained a satisfactory level of performance on grade level in their reading class. This establishes a 77% success sustained effects rate for this group. The students are currently second grade students.

During the three year study, 81% of the students discontinued from the Reading Recovery Program have maintained successful performance levels in their grade and in their reading class.

## Chapter V

### Summary and Findings

The students selected for the program came from the bottom 20% of the first grade reading class. During the study 87% discontinued. They returned to the regular first grade reading class on reading level and continued to perform at this level throughout the first grade year.

Classroom teachers who had students participating in the Reading Recovery Program have consistently given the program high marks throughout the study. The communication between the Reading Recovery teacher and the classroom teacher has been good. The teachers noticed positive changes in the classroom work of participating students. Parents have been complimentary of the Reading Recovery Program to the classroom teachers. All classroom teachers surveyed were interested in having more of their students involved in the program.

Parents of students who participated in the Reading Recovery Program were excited about the program. They gave the program the highest rating. The comments were positive, and they expressed a deep gratitude for their children having the opportunity to be part of this program.

The administrators at Hawthorn School were pleased with the program. There were two administrators during the three year study. The first administrator retired after the first year of the program. The responses were consistent throughout the three year study with the program receiving the highest rating possible.

A study of long term sustained effects of the program revealed that 81% of the students discontinued from the program during the three year study still compare favorably with their peers who did not receive this early intervention program. There is a story behind each student that is not working at grade level. The common thread that weaves through the story is not organically based problems but a story of repeated absenteeism and difficult home life situations. This study compares favorably with other long term studies (Lyons, 1988).

#### Recommendations

1. The Reading Recovery Program at Hawthorn School should continue because of its demonstrated success.
2. Continuing education for the Reading Recovery teacher is important to preserve the integrity of the program.
3. The students discontinued need to be monitored throughout their elementary grades. The unique bond that has occurred between the Reading Recovery teacher and her students can be used to help keep them on level. This needs to be a scheduled part of the Reading Recovery teacher's day.
4. In-service needs to be given to regular classroom teachers to teach them Reading Recovery Program techniques. Techniques could be modified to help reading teachers introduce stories, conduct guided reading lessons, and track student progress. The techniques that have proven successful on a one-on-one basis should be modified and adapted for classroom use.



5. Students discontinued from the Reading Recovery Program need to be tested with a standardized test. This assessment would be more objective than grades.

References

- Allen, D. (1992). Making headway against reading difficulties. The Council Chronicle, 1(3), 12-14.
- Clay, M. M. (1979). Reading: The patterning of complex behavior (2nd ed.). Heinemann, Auckland, New Zealand.
- Clay, M. M. (1984). Observing the young reader. Heinemann, Auckland, New Zealand.
- Clay, M. M. (1985). The early detection of reading difficulties. Heinemann, Auckland, New Zealand.
- Clay, M. M. (1987). Implementing reading recovery: Systematic adaptations to an educational innovation. New Zealand Journal of Educational Studies, 22, 35-58.
- Clay, M. M. (1991). Introducing a new storybook to young readers. The Reading Teacher, 45(4), 264-273.
- Dyer, P. C. (1992). Reading Recovery: A cost-effectiveness and educational-outcomes analysis. Educational Research Service, 2.
- Furniss, E. (1993). Reading Recovery: What is it? Who does it? Why do we need it? Australian Reading Association Today, 2.
- Gaffney, J. S. and Gillespie, B. G. (1989). Reading Recovery Program promotes rapid reading growth. Communiqué, 18(3).
- Holdaway, D. (1979). The foundations of Literacy. Ashton Scholastic, Sydney, Australia.

- Huck, C. S. and Pinneil, G. S. (1985). The Reading Recovery Project in Columbus Ohio: Pilot Year 1984-85. (Technical Report). Columbus, Ohio. The Ohio State University.
- Pinnell, G. S., DeFore, D. E. and Lyons, C. A. (1988). Reading Recovery: Early intervention for at-risk first graders. Educational Research Service. Arlington, Va.
- Pinnell, G. S., Fried, M. D., and Estice, R. M.. (1990). Reading Recovery: Learning how to make a difference. The Reading Teacher. January 282-295.
- Pinneil, G. S. and Woodsey, D. (1985). A study of teacher change during a research-oriented project. NCTE Research Foundation. Urbana, Il.
- Rentel, V. M. and Pinnell, G. S. (1987). Reasoning in Reading Recovery Instruction. Paper presented at the National Reading Conference. ST. Petersburg, Fl.
- Salvin, R. E. (1987). Making Chapter I make a difference. Phi Delta Kappan, 59, 110-119.
- Snow, C. E. and Nino, A. (1986). The contracts of Literacy: What Children Learn From Learning to Read Books. Emergent Literacy: Writing and Reading, 90-115.
- Spiegel, D. L., (1995). A comparison of traditional remedial programs and Reading Recovery: Guidelines for success for all programs. The Reading Teacher. October 86-95.

- Tierney, R. J., Readence, J. E. and Dishner, E. K. (1990). Reading Strategies and Practices: A Compendium, (3rd ed.). Needham Heights, Ma.
- Trelease, J. (1989). The New Read-aloud Handbook, New York, New York.

## Appendix A

## Participating Students

## 1992-93

<u>Student Code #</u>	<u>Results</u>
FY93-1	Moved during the program
FY93-2	Transferred to Special Education
FY93-3	Discontinued
FY93-4	Discontinued
FY93-5	Discontinued
FY93-6	Discontinued
FY93-7	Discontinued
FY93-8	Year ended and student was not finished with program
FY93-9	Discontinued

Analysis: 9 students participated  
 6 students discontinued - completed - graduated  
 1 student moved  
 75% discontinued

## 1993-94

<u>Student Code #</u>	<u>Results</u>
FY94-1	Discontinued
FY94-2	Discontinued
FY94-3	Discontinued
FY94-4	Discontinued
FY94-5	Discontinued
FY94-6	Discontinued
FY94-7	Discontinued
FY94-8	Transferred to Special Education

Analysis: 8 students participated  
 7 students discontinued - completed - graduated  
 87% discontinued

1994-95

<u>Student Code #</u>	<u>Results</u>
FY95-1	Discontinued
FY95-2	Discontinued
FY95-3	Discontinued
FY95-4	Discontinued
FY95-5	Discontinued
FY95-6	Discontinued
FY95-7	Discontinued
FY95-8	Discontinued
FY95-9	Discontinued

Analysis: 9 students participated  
 9 students discontinued - completed - graduated  
 100% discontinued

## Appendix B

## Questionnaire for Classroom Teachers

We are beginning to plan for next year's implementation of Reading Recovery in your school. You are a VALUABLE partner in this program, and we would appreciate your insights and suggestions so that we might continue to implement a quality program. Please briefly respond to the following questions and return this questionnaire to \_\_\_\_\_. Your comments are greatly appreciated.

1. Have any children from your classroom been involved in the Reading Recovery Program this year?

If so, how much has the Reading Recovery teacher let you know about the progress of this/these student(s)? Circle the appropriate number

1	2	3	4	5
nothing				a great deal

2. What changes have you observed in children participating in the Reading Recovery Program as they work in their classroom?
3. What do parents of Reading Recovery children say about the Reading Recovery program?
4. Are you interested in having more children from your classroom involved in the Reading Recovery Program? Why or why not?

5. Reading Recovery has been implemented in your classroom for \_\_\_\_ years. It is important at this time to evaluate the effect of the program on your reading/language arts program. Please complete the following:

Circle the number below which best describes your view of the impact of the Reading Recovery Program on your classroom literacy program in general.

1	2	3	4	5
not a very			a very	
good program			good program	

6. Other comments:

Thanks so much!

This questionnaire was provided by the instructor of the Eastern Illinois University Reading Recovery class.

#### Results from Questionnaire for Classroom Teachers

Question	92-93	93-94	94-95
1	5 5	5 5	5 5
2	+ +	+ +	+ +
3	+ +	+ +	+ +
4	+ +	+ +	+ +
5	5 5	5 5	5 5
6	+ +	+ +	+ NR

Questions one and five are rated 1 to 5 with 1 being the lowest and 5 the highest. For a comment to receive a + score, it must be completely positive.



Appendix C

Dear Parent(s):

We are thinking about the needs of children and their parents as we make plans for next year. Since your child was involved in Reading Recovery, we are asking you to help us think about how Reading Recovery affected your child and your family this year.

Please write brief answers to the following questions and send this paper back to school with your child. We really value your opinions. Your answers are quite IMPORTANT to us as we plan for next year!

1. How has Reading Recovery affected your child's experience in school?
2. If you were telling another parent about the Reading Recovery Program, what would you say?
3. Did the Reading Recovery teacher let you know about your child's progress?  
If so, how were you contacted?
4. Circle the number below which best describes your view of Reading Recovery.

1	2	3	4	5
not a very good program			a very good program	

5. Other Comments:

Thanks so much for your support!

This questionnaire was provided by the instructor of the E.I.U. Reading Recovery class.

## Parent Survey Results

## 1992-93

<u>Questions</u>	Survey:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1		+	+	+	+	+	+	+
2		+	+	+	+	+	+	+
3		NR	+	-	+	+	+	+
4		5	5	4	5	5	4	5
5		+	+	+	+	NR	+	+

## 1993-94

<u>Questions</u>	Survey:	1	2	3	4	5	6
1		+	+	+	+	+	+
2		+	+	+	+	+	+
3		+	NR	+	+	+	+
4		5	5	5	5	5	5
5		+	NR	+	+	+	+

## 1994-95

<u>Questions</u>	Survey:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1		+	+	+	+	+	+	+
2		+	+	+	+	+	+	+
3		+	+	+	+	+	+	+
4		5	5	5	5	5	5	5
5		+	+	+	+	NR	NR	NR

The rating scale on question four was from 1 to 5 with 1 being lowest and 5 the highest. For a comment to receive a positive score, it must be completely positive.

**Appendix D****End of Year Questionnaire for Administrators**

We are beginning to plan for next year's implementation of Reading Recovery in your school. You are a valuable partner in this program, and we would appreciate your insights and suggestions so that we might continue to implement a quality program. Please briefly respond to the following questions and return this questionnaire to \_\_\_\_\_ . Your comments are greatly appreciated.

1. What impact has Reading Recovery had on the children in your school this year?
2. What do teachers in your school say about Reading Recovery?
3. What do parents say about the Reading Recovery Program?
4. Circle the number below which best describes your view of Reading Recovery.  

1	2	3	4	5
not a very				a very good
good program				program
5. What are your concerns about implementing Reading Recovery in your school next year?

Thanks again!

This questionnaire was provided by the instructor of the E.I.U. Reading Recovery class.

**Results of Administrators Survey**

<b><u>Question</u></b>	<b>92-93</b>	<b>93-94</b>	<b>94-95</b>
1	+	+	+
2	+	+	+
3	+	+	+
4	5	5	5
5	+	+	+

The rating scale for question four is 1 to 5 with 1 being the lowest and 5 the highest. For a comment to receive a positive score, it must be completely positive.

## Appendix E

## Sustained Effects

## 1992-93 (Students are now in fourth grade.)

<u>Student Code #</u>	<u>Results</u>	<u>Current on level Grade</u>
FY93-3	Discontinued	C
FY93-4	Discontinued	C
FY93-5	Discontinued	C
FY93-6	Discontinued	B
FY93-7	Discontinued	C
FY93-9	Discontinued -retained in third	not on grade level with others

Analysis      6 students discontinued  
                  5 on grade level with a grade of "C" or better  
                  80 % still demonstrating sustained effects of the program

## 1993-94 (Students are now in third grade.)

<u>Student Code #</u>	<u>Results</u>	<u>Current on level Grade</u>
FY94-1	Discontinued	A
FY94-2	Discontinued	B
FY94-3	Discontinued	C+
FY94-4	Discontinued - retained in second	not on grade level with others
FY94-5	Discontinued	C
FY94-6	Discontinued	C
FY94-7	Discontinued	B

Analysis      7 students discontinued  
                  6 students on grade level with a grade of "C" or better  
                  85% still demonstrating sustained effects of the program

**1994-95 (Students are now in second grade.)**

<b><u>Student Code #</u></b>	<b><u>Results</u></b>	<b><u>Current on level Grade</u></b>
FY95-1	Discontinued	C
FY95-2	Discontinued	A
FY95-3	Discontinued	B+
FY95-4	Discontinued	A
FY95-5	Discontinued	D
FY95-6	Discontinued	F
FY95-7	Discontinued	B
FY95-8	Discontinued	C
FY95-9	Discontinued	A

Analysis      9 students discontinued  
7 students on grade level with a grade of "C" or better  
77% still demonstrating sustained effects of the program